



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/666,521	09/20/2000	Jun Koyama	SEL 209	6933	
7590 03/29/2006			EXAMINER		
Cook Alex McFarron Manzo Cummings & Mehler Ltd			NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T		
Suite 2850					
200 West Adams Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Chicago, IL 60606			2629		
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/666,521	KOYAMA, JUN				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Kimnhung Nguyen	2629				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication approximation of the communication approximation approxima	ppears on the cover she	eet with the correspondence a	ddress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMN .136(a). In no event, however, I d will apply and will expire SIX (i tte, cause the application to become	NUNICATION. may a reply be timely filed by MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status			•				
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Am	endment filed on 1/20/	706				
2a)⊠		is action is non-final.	<u>oo</u> .				
3)							
٥,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dianasit	·						
_	ion of Claims						
4)	Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the applicatio						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
· —	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			•			
6)[\times	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[_	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requiremer	t.				
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objecte	ed to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the dra	awing(s) is objected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the atta	ached Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	ın ngʻority undar 25 LLS	· C & 110(a) (d) ar (f)	•			
•	⊠ All b) Some * c) None of:	in priority under 35 O.S	s.c. y 119(a)-(u) of (i).				
aji	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documer						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri			Stogo			
	application from the International Bure			Stage			
* 0	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis						
	see the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies	not received.	·			
Attachmen		_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Inter	view Summary (PTO-413) r No(s)/Mail Date				
_	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08		e of Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

Art Unit: 2629

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 9-12, 18-22, 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 19 and 28, Yamada et al. discloses in figs. 1, 5, an electronic device comprising an EL display device (11) including a thin film transistor (12); an EL element (11) with the pixel electrode as a cathode (11a, see col. 18, lines 66-67 and col. 19, lines 1-3); and an insulating layer (14c, see col. 7, lines 57-66) for sealing the EL element, an applying means (see drain driver 4) for applying an analog image signal to the EL element; and a correcting means for gamma correcting (2c, fig. 5) the analog image signal.

Regarding claims 2, 10, 20, 29, Yamada et al. discloses further comprising a memory for storing data for the gamma-correcting (see table memory section 2d, and 2e, see col. 10, lines 43-46, and 66-67 and col. 11, lines 1-3).

Regarding claims 3, 12, 22 and 31, Yamada et al. discloses a color filter being formed at position corresponding to the pixel electrode (see col. 22, lines 15-23).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claims 11, 18, 21 and 30, Yamada et al. discloses the EL display device is used in an electronic device selected form the group consisting of an EL display.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 5-7, 14-16, 24-26 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629) in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,388,652).

Regarding claims 5-6,14-15, 24-25 and 33-34, Yamada et al. do not disclose the gamma-correcting amplifies a signal of red, or gamma-correcting attenuates a signal of blue or green. Yamazaki et al. discloses that wherein the gamma-correcting amplifies a signal of red and inherent of attenuates a signal of blue or green (see figure 14, column 18, lines 23-31). I would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the using the gamma-correcting amplifies a signal of red and inherent of attenuates a signal of blue or green as taught by Yamazaki et al. into the system of Yamada et al. because this would provide the analog signals have processed to complete, and these signals are transmitted to the source driving circuit of the system.

Regarding claims 7, 16, 26 and 35, Yamada et al. do not disclose the gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red. Yamazaki et al. discloses the

Art Unit: 2629

gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red (see figure 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using gamma-correcting is independently applied for each of signals of blue, green and red as taught by Yamazaki et al. into the system of Yamada et al. because this would provide an improving the EL display having correction values for driving conditions of individual surface of the electron beam, by applying correction independently.

5. Claims 8, 17, 27 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629) and Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,388,652 cited by Applicant) as applied to claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,445,005).

Yamada et al. and Yamazaki (6,388,652) disclose every feature of the claimed invention as discussed above, however, they do not disclose the EL element comprises a luminescent layer comprising a polymer organic material. Yamazaki et al. (6,445,005) disclose an EL layer (45) is formed and made of polymer type organic material (see column 10, lines 37-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the an EL layer is formed and made of polymer type organic material as taught by Yamazaki et al. (6,445,005) into the device system of Yamazaki et al. (6,388,652) because this would provide a light of white color to be a light emitting layer (see Yamazaki et al., see column 10, lines 62-63), and therefore, increasing the brightness of the display.

6. Claims 4, 13, 23 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629) and Yamazaki et al. (US patent 6,388,652) as applied to claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 above, and further in view of Choi et al. (US patent 6,583,577).

Yamada et al. and Yamazaki (6,388,652) disclose every feature of the claimed invention as discussed above, however, they do not disclose the El element comprises a first pixel comprising a blue luminescent layer, a second pixel comprising a green luminescent layer, and a third pixel comprising a red luminescent layer. Choi et al. disclose in figures 2 and 4 an El element comprises a first pixel (B) comprising a blue luminescent layer, a second pixel (G) comprising a green luminescent layer, and a third pixel (R) comprising a red luminescent layer (see first to third EL diodes, see figure 4, see abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the first, second and third pixels comprising blue, green and red by EL diodes as taught by Choi et al. into the system of Yamada et al. and Yamazaki (6,388,652) because this would be independently driven without a complicatedly-designed data driving circuit, thereby simplifying the data driving circuit as well as reducing the product cost.

Response To Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments filed 1/20/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 8. Applicant states that "As shown in Fig. 4 in Yamada '629, interlayer insulating film 14c is formed on transistor 12 and selection transistor 13. See also e.g. cols. 7-8 in Yamazaki '629. EL element 11 is formed insulating film 14c. Hence, insulating film 14c does not seal EL

Art Unit: 2629

element 1 1, as recited in the independent claims of the present application, but instead is covered by EL element 11".

Accordingly, Yamada '629 and the other cited references) does not disclose or suggest an insulating layer for sealing the EL element, as recited in independent Claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 of the present application. Therefore, these independent claims and the claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references.

Examiner respectively disagrees because Yamada '629 discloses an insulating film 14c is formed on transistor 12 and selection transistor 12 (see col. 7, lines 57-66), the insulating film 14c is cover by EL element 11, thus means the insulating film 14c seals the EL element 11 of the display system. For these reasons the rejectioned are maintained.

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7698. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI, FROM 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimnhung Nguyen March 21, 2006

> RICHARD HJERPE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600